REMARKS

Claims 1-79 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In a Final Office Action dated September 18, 2007, claims 1-79 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants are amending paragraphs [0001] and [0002] of the Specification and submitting the Supplemental Application Data Sheet filed herewith to delete the claims of priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 10/404,916 and 10/404,927. Applicants are also amending paragraph [0003] the Specification to include the U.S. Patent Application Number of a related application that was not previously included. Following entry of this amendment, this application will contain no claims of priority to the aforementioned U.S. Patent Applications.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Davies and Klotz

In the 3rd paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 20, 27-32, 35-49 54-55, 59-68, and 73-74 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085759 ("Davies") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,540 (Klotz). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been specifically amended to recite:

> receiving an image of a document index, *the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document*;

locating, on the document index image, at least a first graphic representation of a first stored document;
locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;
determining that the first sticker specifies a first action be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation; and
performing the first action to cause a change to the first stored document.

The remaining independent claims 42, 44 and 63 have been similarly amended to recite elements similar to those above for Claim 1.

These aspects of the claimed invention pertain to the manipulation of collection of stored documents without requiring users to interact with a user interface or a hardware device. The method is based on adhering stickers specifying actions proximate to graphic representations of the stored documents in a document index. An image of the document index, which includes a plurality of graphic representations of the documents, is received. The graphic representation of the documents allow for fast and easy identification of the document by providing a snapshot view of a particular documents. The graphic representations of documents and stickers are located by the image reader independently. A sticker specifying an action on a document is determined based on a comparison of the location of the sticker and the location of a graphic representation of a document. The ability to manipulate collections of different electronically stored documents/files based on adhering stickers on a hardcopy document image provides a level of facility in document manipulation using hard-copy documents not possible or suggested by the art of record.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, Davies, as presently understood, merely describes a system in which tags are adhered to *a single hardcopy document* to specify an action or service to be performed on that single

hardcopy document and therefore does not disclose "receiving an image of *a document index*." A document index, as claimed in the present application includes a plurality of graphic representations of documents. Davies therefore does not show "receiving an image of a document index*, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document*."

Further, Davies does not disclose "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document *based on a location* of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation." Davies discloses a one step system of identifying tags adhered to *single hardcopy documents* for which they specify actions. Davies also discloses a system of identifying tags adhered to cover sheets capable of being associated with single hard copy documents for which they specify actions. However, this is not the same as the additional step to determine the documents for which the stickers specify actions *based on a location* of the sticker, and as such, Davies does not teach determining the documents for which the stickers specify action based on the sticker's location. The document index, as claimed in the present application, includes multiple graphic representations of different documents. Stickers are adhered proximate to the graphic representations of the stored documents. Graphic representations of documents and stickers are located by the image reader independently. A sticker specifying an action on a document is determined based on a *comparison of the* ***location*** *of the sticker and the* ***location*** *of a graphic representation of a document.* Therefore, determining the documents for which the stickers specify actions is based on the location of the sticker. For at least the reasons stated above, Davies does not teach or suggest "determining that the first sticker specifies a first

action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation."

Klotz does not remedy these deficiencies. Klotz merely describes a document surrogate that contains summaries of documents. Each document summary includes three components: a selection box, a first window, and a second window. *See* Klotz, col. 13, lines 52-58. This is not the same as a "document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, *wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document*."

The Examiner admits that Davies does not teach "locating, on the document index image, at least a first graphic representation of a first stored document." However, Klotz fails to remedy this deficiency. Klotz merely describes a selection box as a way for a user to select a subset of documents. The selection box in Klotz is merely a square check box in which a mark can be placed in order to indicate selection of the corresponding document. As claimed in the present invention, "*each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document*." Therefore, Klotz does not teach or suggest "locating, on the document index image, at least a first graphic representation of a first stored document," the *graphic representation uniquely identifying a document.*

As discussed above, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63, respectively. Additionally, claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 recite features not

disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 2-6, 20, 27-32, 35-41, 43, 45-49, 54-55, 59-62, 64-68, and 73-74 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Davies, Klotz, Cooper and Cotte

In the 4th paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davies and Klotz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,223 ("Cooper") and U.S. Patent No. 5,499,108 ("Cotte"). This rejection is now traversed.

As discussed above, Davies fails to teach or suggest several aspects of the claimed invention. Namely, Davies does not teach or suggest "receiving an image of a document index, the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document," nor does Davies teach or suggest "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation." Also, as discussed above, Klotz fails to remedy the deficiencies of Davies.

Further, neither Cooper nor Cotte remedy the deficiencies of Davies and Klotz. Specifically, neither Cotte not Cooper disclose features to support the manipulation of collections of stored documents.

Cooper is directed to the manipulation of electronic documents through the use of special purpose cover forms which specify actions such as labeling, retrieving and storing. Cotte is directed to a system in which the software of the input device recognizes special commands to issue to a computer based on pre-defined command symbols and auxiliary symbols contained within a scanned document.

Both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose "receiving *an image of a document index*, the document index *comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents*, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document," an integral feature for the manipulation of stored collections of documents. Cooper does disclose the use of special cover forms with check boxes for marking off documents and special fields for handwritten labels (*see* Cooper FIG. 9. and col. 3 lines 46-50). However, Cooper is directed to the generation of special cover forms containing handwritten labels (document image domains) and checkboxes representing stored documents that are *pre-selected* by the user for manipulation, not of an image of document index. Col. 4, lines 6-12 of Cooper state, "According to this aspect, a user would *request a listing of the labels of an appropriate set of files* which are stored on or accessible to the computer. In response to the request for the listing, the computer generates a *display of the image domain in file label, if any, and possibly other indications, for each file*."

Further, Cooper merely describes techniques for assigning a file label to a file. A relationship is established between an image domain file label and a file name assigned by the computer, so that the label can be employed to assist the user in identifying the file. In particular, Cooper does not provide any hint or suggestion receiving an image of a document index wherein the document index comprises a plurality of representation of documents. The instruction form disclosed in Cooper is not a type of document index, but rather is a page for providing information about the document following the instruction form, where the information is an image file label of the document or processing instructions for the document. *See* Cooper, col. 9, lines 21-30; FIG. 4, item 62; col. 3, lines 46-55.

Cotte is solely directed to the recognition of command symbols, merely describing symbol recognition software for recognizing symbols on a document to be scanned which indicate whether the document is to be faxed, sent as e-mail, and the like (col. 11, lines 28-30), and does not disclose an image of a document index. Cotte teaches the use of stickers that can be placed on the document to be processed, and further describes "hot zones" for stickers in which the recognition software looks for attributes such as fax phone numbers and the like (col. 12, lines 5-9). However, Cotte fails to describe any technique for identifying a target *based on the location of the sticker* on the documents as claimed herein.

Thus, both Cotte and Cooper fail to disclose "an image of a document index**,** the document index comprising a plurality of graphic representations of documents, wherein each graphic representation uniquely identifies a document" and also both Cooper and Cooper fail to disclose "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document based on a location of the first sticker with respect to the first graphic representation."

As discussed above, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose a document index image upon which to adhere stickers. Cooper further **teaches away** from the use of stickers to specify actions, instead using special purpose forms for different types of actions to perform upon selected documents represented by their name or image label (see FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Accordingly, neither Cooper nor Cotte disclose "determining that the first sticker specifies a first action to be performed on the first stored document *based on a location* of the first sticker *with respect to the first graphic representation*". Cotte does not disclose either a document index or a graphic representation. In Cooper, actions to be performed

upon documents are determined from user selection of check boxes (see FIG. 4, FIG. 9, FIG. 12).

Claims 1, 42, 44 and 63 have been shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Davies. Claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 depend from claims 1, 42, 44 and 63. For at least the reasons above, neither Cotte nor Cooper remedy the deficiencies of Davies. Additionally, claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 recite features not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicant submit that claims 7-18, 21-26, 33-34, 50-53, 56-28, 69-72, and 75-79 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 through 79, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
JOHN BARRUS ET AL.

Date: October 30, 2007

By: /Kanda Ishihara/

Attorneys for Assignee
Kanda Ishihara, Reg. No. 56,607
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7805
Fax: (650) 938-5200